

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 1870.

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY JAMES BOWES & SONS, BEDFORD ROW,
1870.

2
4/06070
PN304
N.T.

from The Bishop.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 6TH DAY OF JULY, 1870.

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY JAMES BOWES & SONS, BEDFORD ROW,
1870.

BX
5611
N8
B5

Special
coll.

This Charge was also delivered to the Clergy of Prince Edward Island, in St. Peter's Church in Charlottetown, with some alterations in the portions relating to local matters.

A CHARGE.

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—

WE are naturally disposed to exaggerate the importance of events occurring in our own time, when we compare them with the past, without making due allowance for the effect of distance upon the apparent magnitude of objects, but I think that we may assume, without risk of error in our estimate, that, in the four years which have elapsed since the last visitation, more events have occurred materially affecting the interests of the Church than in any similar period within the memory of living men. In confirmation of this I need only mention, the disestablishment of the Irish Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Lambeth Conference, and the Council at Rome, for we cannot be wholly uninterested in the proceedings of this Assembly representing so large a proportion of the christians of the Western Church, although without any claim to be styled Ecumenical. Then we have to notice also the new Lectionary, the proposed revision of our translation of the Bible, the first steps towards providing adequate Episcopal superintendence for the increasing multitudes in our Mother Country by the appointment of Suffragan Bishops; and on the other hand the gradual approach to a separation between Church and State, by the abolition of Church rates,—the opening of the consecrated burial grounds to ministers other than those of the Established Church,—the disendowment of the Church in the West Indies,—and the gradual secularisation of the ancient universities.

Having spoken at some length concerning the Conference held at Lambeth in 1867, in my address to the Synod in the following year, of which address the substance was published, I do not intend to detain you with many observations upon it to-day, but I cannot pass it over altogether upon this occasion. It was especially remarkable as the first attempt to bring together representatives of

the whole Anglican Communion, and notwithstanding all the statements of unfriendly critics, I cannot but think that it was eminently successful, having regard both to the number of the Bishops who attended there, and to the spirit in which its deliberations were conducted.

The proceedings of the Conference have been freely discussed, by friends and foes, some maintaining that too much was attempted, and others complaining that so little was accomplished; some having charged it with assuming to determine matters, with which it should not have meddled, while others who expected it to deal, or to attempt to deal, with all existing errors and evils, have taunted it with disappointing the reasonable expectations of Churchmen. But much would have been gained, if it had only proved the unity in the faith of the several Branches of our Communion, and the possibility of meeting together, and discussing matters on which much diversity of opinion exists, with mutual forbearance and charity. Much more than this was however effected, and we have the actual results in the Introduction to the Resolutions, the Pastoral address to the whole of the Anglican Communion, and the recommendations of the several committees, prepared with great care, and presented to the adjourned meeting held in December in the same year.

These have no legal force, but surely every Churchman must feel bound to defer to the decisions of an Assembly, comprising an absolute majority of the whole of the Bishops of our Communion throughout the world; and their recommendations appear to be generally accepted by those to whose condition they are applicable, for the Conference was held, with reference more particularly to the wants and difficulties of the unestablished Branches. Thus the way was prepared for the great work, to which the Irish Archbishops and Bishops little expected that they would so soon be called, the preparation of a system of government for their Branch of the United Church; and it may not be too much to assume that the great Head of the Church, ever watchful over its welfare, had specially brought together this Assembly of its chief Pastors, in preparation for the changes speedily about to take place.

Of the manner in which that disestablishment was brought about, and of its probable effect, it is useless now to speak; but

the process was doubtless watched with much interest by you all, and it has certainly enforced the lesson that it is vain to put any confidence in man. We have, however, this confidence that He, in whom we trust, will overrule all for good ; and it is cheering to find that our brethren have been equal to the emergency, that they have heartily set about their work, and that in all probability *this*, which appeared to be so great an evil, may eventually conduce to their best interests, that the Church may start upon her new course, with new life, and a determination to prove that the Church of Christ is not dependent upon the will or favor of princes, that her power is inherent in herself, and that, when delivered from the temptation to rely upon an arm of flesh, she may actually increase her strength, through a simple dependence upon her Lord and Master.

That the disestablishment of the Church in England must sooner or later follow, can hardly be doubted, and perhaps by the agency of those *now* holding the reins of power, notwithstanding Mr. Gladstone's late assurance that they "do not intend to go on in that direction, that they deprecate it, and would regard it as a national mischief." Let us pray that the evil day may be averted, or at least long deferred, for whatever might be the consequences to the Church, to the *State* they would unquestionably be most disastrous. We can partly judge of *this* by our own experience, although here the evils are as nothing compared with what they would be in an old country, where all the chief institutions are more or less connected with the established Church. Some persons indeed, smarting under the unsatisfactory judgments of our present Courts, and unable to endure the bondage of union with the State, imagine that disestablishment would be a cure for all our evils ; but I believe that they are very much mistaken, and that they would have to complain of other grievances, inseparable from the voluntary system, not less burdensome than those removed.

In the meantime we who, at an early stage of the movement, took an active part in establishing the Synod in this Diocese, cannot but rejoice in perceiving the steady increase of adherents to the principle then advocated by us. Of course the crowning triumph is the adoption of a constitution similar to our own, by the Irish Branch of the United Church, immediately after the passing of the Act disestablishing it ; but besides this we have a progressive

recognition of the right of the laity to be consulted, in the adoption by many of the Bishops of the established Church in England, of conferences, in which the laity are invited to take a part, and even of formal Diocesan Synods. The annual Congresses, too, although intended only for discussion, and not for action, appear now to be permanently established, and are indirectly exercising a sensible influence.

The scandal of the retention of office, by the Bishop of Natal, still continues under the protection of the State; but we have reason to be thankful that, so far as the Church is concerned, the honor of her Lord has been vindicated, and that by the consecration of Bishop Macrorie, a chief Pastor has been provided for the suffering, destitute flock, who however still claim our sympathy, inasmuch as their number has been diminished by the desertion of some who have been seduced by the false teachers, and they have been despoiled of buildings and endowments given for the service of God.

It is here worthy of notice that, the distinguished Bishop of New Zealand having been transferred to an English Diocese, the Colonial Church has now a most able and influential representative in the Convocation of Canterbury, and in the House of Lords. That he fully merited this elevation can hardly be disputed; but on the other hand the appointment to the see of Exeter has caused much anxiety and distress, in the minds of many members of the Church, since it appears to prove, if proof were needed, that no objections on her part will be regarded, when the first Minister of the Crown thinks fit to nominate, to a vacant Bishopric, a clergyman whose teaching may be considered dangerous by her most able and devoted sons.

The deaths have been numerous; and we have to deplore the removal of the good Archbishop, who so ably presided over the Conference assembled at Lambeth, together with fifteen Bishops from England and Ireland. In Scotland the Primus, and in the Colonies the Metropolitans of Canada and of India with four other Bishops have been taken away.

While mentioning the chief Pastors who have been removed from their flocks, I must not omit one to whom, although not a Bishop, the Colonial Church is deeply indebted, the Rev. Ernest

Hawkins, for a quarter of a century the Secretary and main spring of the venerable S. P. G. On his promotion to a canonry in Westminster Abbey he resigned his office, but continued to afford valuable assistance until his death. Among the results of his labors, were the increase, during his tenure of office, of the income of the Society from £16,500 to £91,700, and of the Colonial Episcopate from eight to forty-seven Sees.

From among ourselves only three have been taken, Rev. W. Morris, Rev. J. Alexander, well known for his labors on the Eastern Shore, in days when that part of the Province was much less accessible than it is now, and the Rev. Rector of St. George's, after more than forty years service in this Diocese, to which, although he was ordained in England, he determined to devote himself, recognising the claims of his native land, an example not to be overlooked in these days, when so many, thinking only of their own interests, are inclined to desert it, being apparently regardless of the wants of their fellow countrymen. He will be much missed in his Parish, where he ever manifested his belief in the truth of the word "it is more blessed to give than to receive," receiving but little from his people, and liberally contributing towards every good work. The institutions, for the relief of the aged and the orphans, will more particularly miss his fostering care, and especially the latter, as we cannot expect to find another who will be so truly a father to those poor destitute children.

This is another taken from the list of clergy paid by the British Government, which, comprising sixteen names when I arrived here has now been reduced to eight, the whole amount of his salary being lost to the Diocese on the death or retirement of each of those incumbents.

We have also lost sixteen by removal, while seventeen candidates have been admitted to the order of Deacons, and two clergymen in full orders have been received from other Dioceses.

The deficiency in the supply of clergy is a very serious matter, and I fear that the evil is likely to be aggravated, for it is felt even in England, and here there is a continually increasing demand for the ministrations of God's holy word and Sacraments, according to the order of our branch of the Church, and several additional ministers could be profitably employed, if we had the men, either

in entirely new fields or in Missions urgently requiring division. In some of these cases the people could themselves provide the required stipends, but generally some assistance more or less is needed. Since the change of system, in consequence of the reduction in the grants from England, whereby the clergy, instead of receiving definite stipends, from sources upon which they could rely, are left in a great measure dependent upon the chances of voluntary contributions, it is useless to look for many men from abroad, since they cannot be expected to come to a strange country, without any certainty of obtaining even the most moderate maintenance. For the same reason, the supply of candidates through our own College is likely to diminish, inasmuch as parents will not encourage their sons to devote themselves to the ministry, without any security that they will obtain a reasonable remuneration for their labors, or at any rate a bare subsistence. I do not, however, despair of an improvement in this respect, as the Laity become more deeply imbued with the conviction of their duty, to take care "that they who preach the Gospel shall live of the Gospel."

I have reason to think that our people contribute much less, towards the support of their ministers, than the members of any other denomination of Christians in this Province, and I am compelled very reluctantly to admit, that this inferiority is to be attributed mainly to the abundant, and long continued aid received by them from the venerable Society, to whose fostering care we have been so long indebted. They have been so long nursed, that they have not learned to walk alone, and the fear now is that the support may be too suddenly withdrawn, without the allowance of sufficient time for the strengthening of the powers, which they are only just beginning to exercise. We, too, my Rev. Brethren have not been blameless in this matter, for some of us have been too much influenced by a false delicacy, and have refrained from enforcing the duty of giving, with sufficient frequency and earnestness. I must, therefore, urge you all to bear in mind, that it is your duty to teach your people what is required of them, with respect to this very important duty, as it is binding upon every Christian. You may be sometimes suspected of interested motives, but you must not mind such unfounded suspicions, you must clear

yourselves ; for if, through your neglect, the people in any place, having failed to perform their part, are deprived of the spiritual advantages which might otherwise have been secured to them, you cannot be blameless. Teach them, according to God's word what *He* requires of them, try to make them understand that it is a privilege to be permitted to offer unto the Lord, and that what is given is to be regarded as given to *Him*. And take care to make this evident to all, by the manner in which you deal with the collections taken in your Churches. If, as I have too frequently witnessed, you allow the money collected to be put away in a corner, or in the vestry, you cannot expect the people to feel that giving they are performing a solemn act, an important part of public worship, and if you would have them judge rightly concerning it, you must have every collection brought to you and reverently offer it upon the Table of the Lord. If you faithfully and perseveringly teach these truths, both by word and deed, you will find your perseverance will at length produce the intended effect, that at all events there will be a decided improvement, even though it may be much less than it ought to be.

You are all aware that our difficulties are to be traced, in a great measure, to the partial failure of the scheme happily inaugurated ten years ago, and which, if it had succeeded, would have relieved us from the embarrassment caused by the diminution of aid from England. With respect to the causes of this failure, I will not trust myself to speak, for if I were to speak at all, I should be bound to express my deliberate judgment, and to use strong language, respecting the lax opinions, and unfounded excuses, under cover of which the Church has been deprived of funds *formally pledged* to the furtherance of this scheme. Whether the Committee entrusted with this important charge did what was best, with respect to the defaulters, may be fairly discussed, but we cannot doubt that they did what they believed to be most expedient, and upon the whole beneficial to the Church ; and I hope that they may yet succeed in making up what is wanting, so as to enable us to use the contributions of those who have long since faithfully fulfilled their promises. The success attending the tour of the indefatigable agent, who so ably worked for the Endowment Fund last year, through the West of the Province, encourages the belief

that, if the city and the rest of the Province could be awakened in the same manner to a sense of their responsibility, the great object would be accomplished, without further delay.

In the meantime, we have to depend upon our Diocesan Church Society, and I hope that its claims are generally fully explained, so that they may be thoroughly understood by your people. It alone has thus far interposed, so as to modify the consequences of the reduction of the grants of the S. P. G., and by a liberal expenditure of its own income has counteracted the effect of that diminution; so that every clergyman, upon the lists of the S. P. G., is in fact actually receiving from our own Society a percentage of his stipend, of which he would otherwise have been deprived. But this liberality is exhausting its resources, and cannot be continued, and being little understood is injuring its reputation; for the Society by this expenditure is hampered in its own proper work, and is obliged to disappoint those who might reasonably expect aid from its general funds. You will perceive, therefore, that it is incumbent upon you, to do all in your power, sparing no pains, to increase its means of usefulness.

You can have no scruple in calling upon *all* your flock to support this Society, because it is entirely free from party views, and party influence, and truly represents the whole Church in this Diocese, every clergyman having of right a voice in its management, and the lay committee being elected by the whole body of members. It moreover acts upon the sound principle of refraining from interference of any kind, with the appointment of clergymen, leaving *that* entirely in the hands of those to whom it of right belongs, and only supplying funds according to the necessities of the several Missions, so far as it is able to do so. If you will advocate its claims with earnestness, carefully explaining its merits and the nature of the work which it is faithfully performing, I trust there will be no lack of support and that, the love of Christ constraining them, they whom God has blessed with the means of doing good will cheerfully and liberally contribute for the benefit of their poorer brethren, who, without their aid must be deprived of the preaching of the Gospel, destitute of instruction in the word of life. In such a cause, surely minor differences will be disregarded, and they who love the Lord Jesus Christ will cheerfully

contribute of their substance, fearing lest, through their neglect, even one soul should be left without the knowledge of the Saviour.

A more flourishing condition of our finances would probably have its effect also upon the supply of men, but *this* I am inclined to think must always depend to some extent upon yourselves. I apprehend that there are always some young men, who would be willing to devote themselves to the work of the ministry if they were convinced that it is their duty to do so, and that they may thus do good service for God. Some of the most worthy and desirable are probably restrained from offering themselves, by fears of their own unfitness, and a high estimate of the qualifications required for that holy office. Now if you would make a point of looking out, in your respective cures, for youths of good promise, from among your Sunday School Pupils or others, and would encourage them to devote themselves to this good work, some would doubtless be persuaded. And then the scruples of parents must also be combated, and they who have a qualified son should learn that they are bound to devote him to the work of the Lord, and especially, if they have the means of maintaining that son, that they should rather expend their money, in helping to support him as a minister for some poor congregation, than in promoting his worldly advancement. Men appear to think that their money is thrown away, if they give it to God; whereas this is, in truth, the most secure and profitable investment, while the more attractive modes of employing it, with the prospect of a large increase, are frequently found to be delusive.

Again the position of Schoolmasters is now so much improved, that it is worth while for many to aim at it, who would formerly have despised it; and any studious youth may prudently prepare himself, with a view either to teaching, or to the ministry, as he may prefer when the time comes to decide. The small proportion of schoolmasters of the Church of England, compared with Presbyterians, Baptists, and others, is very unsatisfactory, and I trust that you will seriously consider the extent of the evil, and your own duty with respect to it, with a view to its removal or diminution.

It may be thought that, as there is no religious instruction in our public schools, the views of the master are now of little consequence, but this is a mistaken notion, for supposing, which we do

not admit, that he has little or no influence in this respect, upon the opinions of his pupils, he must from his position exercise an influence in his neighbourhood *for* or *against* you. And where there is a Churchman, he may be expected to afford valuable aid in your Sunday School and in your work generally. I am constantly told, when enquiring about the Sunday Schools connected with the several congregations, that it is impossible to maintain one, in consequence of the inability of the clergyman to attend, and the lack of other persons qualified to superintend in his absence; but this difficulty is not likely to occur where the master of the daily School is a churchman. Although I have often spoken upon this subject of the Sunday School, I cannot pass it over without a few words; too much importance cannot be attributed to it, and I have little hope of such growth and prosperity in our Church, as we may reasonably expect, unless due attention be given to it. There are still many congregations without Sunday Schools; and several of them are only conducted through the summer, the summer being so strictly interpreted that, in the month of May, I have found such Schools still closed. Now if it *be so* that, in the depth of winter, the children may not be able to attend, yet surely some of them may in every case be gathered together much earlier in the year than May or June; and every effort should be made to keep these Schools open as long as possible. Although on Sundays you may not be able to visit your Schools, you can doubtless, in many cases arrange to meet your teachers on a week-day evening, (most of them probably being occupied through the day) and impart to them the instruction which they may in turn communicate to the children.

It ought to be needless to state, that the Church Catechism should always be the basis of the instruction afforded; but unhappily we have in some cases the extraordinary anomaly of professed Church Schools, in which this instruction, specially provided for the young, is ignored or contemptuously rejected, by those who fancy themselves qualified to be teachers, while, by their arrogant assumption of superior wisdom, they prove that they "know nothing yet as they ought to know." Notwithstanding my anxiety for the general introduction and maintenance of Sunday Schools, I have no hesitation in saying that you will be better without the services of

any teachers who are unwilling to make the Catechism the basis of their teaching ; for they must be radically unsound, who are unable to digest the food provided by the Church for the babes in Christ.

The problem of a system of Education which may fairly be sustained at the public expense is still unsolved. In England it is causing much perplexity, the old system, under which proportionate grants were made to several religious denominations, having proved to be unsatisfactory, and much difficulty being experienced in framing a scheme which shall include impartial religious instruction. It is, however, cheering to find that the secularists are opposed by the great mass of the people who happily object to a "gigantic scheme of Godless education." In this Province, I think we all agree, that instruction without religion, is not worthy of the name of Education, and that the best system would be that, under which each body of Christians would be enabled to maintain Schools for its own children ; but then arises the question, is *this* practicable ? could this principle be fully and impartially worked out, would not thinly peopled districts be left without Schools, or with a School of the leading denomination, wherein all others would have to submit to teaching, according to the views of the majority ? And if this be so, is it not better to allow the State merely to furnish secular instruction, leaving parents and pastors to supply the religious element ? My own opinion is probably known to you all ; but I ought perhaps to repeat it, as the subject has lately been much discussed. I hold to the fullest extent, that education without religion is worse than useless, for since "knowledge is power," it is placing weapons in the hands of persons ignorant of their proper use, and likely to injure themselves and others ; and our experience of the effect of the experiment in the United States, is in accordance with our anticipations. Moreover, the two departments ought to be combined, and the religious training should be regarded as a necessary element in every plan of education, and not as an addition or companion to it. The teacher ought to be at liberty to introduce his religious principles, in connection with all his teaching, but then I am compelled to admit that, even with the utmost amount of assistance that could be afforded from the public funds, separate Schools could not be maintained throughout the Province, and, in consequence of the unhappy divisions prevailing among Christians,

It would not be possible, without injustice to some, to have religious instruction given in the common Schools. To profess to give such instruction, divested of all that would be contrary to the tenets of any professing Christians, would in my opinion be such a caricature of the truth, that it would be far more injurious than beneficial. The only *practicable* plan therefore appears to me to be, that of a strictly secular education in the public Schools, fairly and honestly carried out, with care on the part of the authorities, that there shall be no tampering with the belief of any of the pupils, that the teachers shall honestly abstain from attempting to impart religious instruction, and that the books used shall be carefully selected upon this principle, no others being allowed in those Schools. Against the plan of providing for the introduction of religion, by dividing all Schools into Roman Catholic and Protestant, I most strenuously protest; for from the so-called Protestant Schools, all dogmatic teaching, upon many important points, must be strictly excluded, while the Roman Catholics would be enabled to inculcate their own peculiar truths, in all their details at the public expense. The belief that they are doing this in some Schools, under our present system, has lately caused much dissatisfaction, and we are bound to insist that the authorities shall take care that the system adopted, and sanctioned by law, shall be impartially administered.

I have been accustomed to mention any judgments affecting the interpretation of our formularies, or having respect to doctrine or discipline, but although there have been several causes before the Courts in England, during the past four years, there has not been much in which we Colonists are concerned.

The only cause decided by the Committee of Council, requiring notice, is that of *Martin v. Mackonochie*, being an appeal from part of a very elaborate judgment delivered by Sir R. Phillimore, before whom Mr. Mackonochie had been charged with the following four offences: 1. Elevating the paten and chalice, and prostrating himself before the consecrated elements. 2. The use of incense. 3. Mixing water with the wine at the time of celebration. 4. Use of lighted candles on communion table. Of these practices, the elevation and the incense had been discontinued, and he was admonished not to recur to them. The mixing water with the wine, *during the service*, was forbidden; but the lights

were pronounced lawful, and no judgment was given with respect to the prostration or excessive kneeling. An appeal was therefore entered against the judgment, on the last two points; and the Privy Council decided that the lighted candles are not lawful, that no kneeling of the celebrant is allowable during the prayer of consecration; but that he is to kneel when he himself receives the Sacrament. In the course of their judgment, their Lordships stated their opinion that, in the rubric before the prayer of consecration, the words, "standing before the table," apply to the *whole* sentence. Hence the position of the celebrant, when saying that prayer, is determined to be, not at the north side, whatever may be meant by that ambiguous expression in the rubric, but *before* the table. They repeated and affirmed the rule, laid down in the Knightsbridge case, that "in the performance of the services, rites and ceremonies, ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed, no omission and no addition can be permitted," and "no distinction can be drawn between acts which are important, and those which appear to be trivial." Lastly they confirmed the judgment, upon the "ornaments rubric" in the beginning of the Prayer Book, that by "ornaments" is meant, those articles the use of which, in the services and ministrations of the Church, is prescribed in the *first* Prayer Book of Edward VI., which was authorized by Act of Parliament.

Another case of importance has been heard, and judgment has been delivered, by Sir R. Phillimore; but an appeal has been entered before the Privy Council, which has not yet been heard. There were thirty-three charges against the defendant, Rev. J. Purchas of Brighton, of which the Judge observed that some were extremely trivial, and some points had been decided by the Privy Council in the Mackonochie case. Mr. Purchas was charged with wearing unauthorized vestments; and Sir Robert decided that those mentioned in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. are legal, viz., for ministers officiating at the communion service, cope, vestment or chasuble, surplice, alb and tunicle, and in all other services surplice only, without stole or addition of any kind. Whether this is to be regarded as law, must depend upon the result of the Appeal to the Privy Council.

There has also been a judgment of some interest, as determining the limits of the authority of Churchwardens to remove any ornament or piece of Church furniture, of which they may disapprove. Sir R. Phillimore said, "the Churchwardens were the officers of the Ordinary and the Parish, and the first principle was, that their authority, even in matters most within their special cognisance, must be exercised under the control of the Ordinary." The office was one of "observation and complaint; and except in extraordinary cases *not* one of immediate action, or exercise of individual power. It could not be too plainly stated that ornaments, which had been *de facto*, though illegally or irregularly, placed in the Church, could only be legally under the sanction of the Ordinary removed." It has further been decided that, although the Churchwardens have the right of access to the Church at proper seasons, the minister alone has a right to the custody of the keys.

That we are not bound by English Legislation, or Privy Council judgments, in Ecclesiastical matters, I think we may safely assume; but at the same time they may be taken as a guide, and at least indicate the nature of the judgment likely to be pronounced, in case of any appeal, incidentally involving such matters, carried to the judicial Committee through our Supreme Court. That we are still less affected by the proceedings of Convocation is certain, but desiring to remain in union with our Mother Church and to preserve as far as possible identity with her, it may be expedient to follow in her steps, and to adopt measures when perfected which have originated *there*. Thus it seems to me that we should certainly adopt the new Lectionary, not assuming that it is perfect; for probably we could all of us suggest what seem to us to be improvements, we may regret the loss of some old Chapters, and prefer others to the new selections, but we may be satisfied, from the trouble bestowed upon it, the persons engaged in preparing it, and the ordeal through which it has passed, that nothing more generally satisfactory could be expected. It cannot be doubted that, taken as a whole, it is much superior to our present arrangement, and if we were to refuse it, when it comes into use in England, we should subject ourselves to much inconvenience. We should lose the satisfaction now derived from the knowledge that, day by day we are reading the same portions of Scripture with our

Brethren throughout the world; and when the existing stock of Prayer Books and Church services is exhausted, we should be unable to procure copies, according to the present use. An addition to the Table of Proper Psalms has been suggested, and we might welcome also such an addition as we find in the American Prayer Book, of selections to be used at discretion, instead of those in ordinary course.

But it is not only in the *order* of the lessons taken from the Holy Scriptures that we are to have a change; the very translation which we have used as the authorized version is to be subjected to revision. We all are conscious that it is susceptible of improvement, and must admit that it is not right to put forth, as the word of God, what deeper research and a sound criticism have determined, not to convey an adequate conception of the true meaning of the original language, or even not to be entitled to a place in the sacred text. Nevertheless, one naturally dreads any tampering with words, which have become so dear to many devout believers that any alteration may seem to them almost to partake of the nature of sacrilege; and I am not surprised that, in the Lower House of Convocation, many were reluctant to sanction the revision, although in truth it has become a necessity, and the reverence due to our translation of the Scriptures can only be preserved, by an honest endeavor to remove all the blemishes which it has acquired in passing through the hands of men. If this revision is required, by the peculiar circumstances of this age, we may be thankful that our own Convocation has taken the lead, while such arrangements have been made as will best secure the confidence of Englishmen of all denominations, the co-operation having been solicited of the most learned, and best qualified, scholars, without respect to their particular tenets.

The endeavors to obtain a *general* revision of the Prayer Book have been continued, but for the present at least are not likely to be successful; and we may hope that this precious inheritance will be left to us without further change; for although every one might point out some alterations which would be acceptable to him, it is more than probable that all would regret the consequences of opening the door; for if each were to eliminate what appears to him capable of improvement, substituting or adding at his discre-

tion, the revised Book would be far from being as generally acceptable as the present. But *one* change, whether for good or for evil, will probably be secured, having been countenanced to a certain extent in high quarters. There is a determined opposition to the retention of the so-called Creed of St. Athanasius, in its present position, and I have no doubt that the objectors will by some means obtain liberty to refrain from repeating it, as ordered by the present rubric.

Various propositions have been offered; that the rubric shall be made permissive, instead of obligatory, that the creed shall be retained in our Prayer Books, but never publicly recited, or that it may be sung in the course of the service as a Hymn, but not as a Creed. It is urged that the American Church has omitted it, but there is a great difference between omitting, in framing a new Book, and deliberately striking out a formula which we have been in the habit of using. Moreover its omission has been much regretted, and its restoration proposed, by leading authorities in that Church, having regard to its effect as a protest against Universalism. Plausible objections are made to the damnatory clauses and it is alleged that they are commonly misunderstood, and interpreted as meaning much more than is intended by them, while ordinary minds are painfully perplexed by the number of metaphysical propositions, to which, in themselves unintelligible, these awful sanctions are applied. There is much to be said on both sides of the question, and perhaps we are unable altogether to appreciate the perplexities of some minds, so that we may allow that, if by any means this creed may be preserved as an authoritative statement of truth, without being rehearsed by the congregation, it may be well to remove it from its present place; but so long as it remains preceded by the present rubric, we cannot be justified in omitting it, and he who would omit it because he does not believe its statements, should consider whether he can honestly retain office in the Church.

This Creed, having been adopted only in the West, cannot be called in any sense a creed of the Universal Church; but *that* which truly is so is also now the subject of controversy, and it is argued that in its present form, the Nicene Creed, being interpolated, is not to be regarded as the true creed of the Church at all.

I will not enter upon this controversy now, but it is certainly to be regretted that words have been introduced by one division of the Church, which cannot be accepted by the whole; and while we persist in maintaining this addition to the Creed of the undivided Church, as confirmed and adopted by the general Councils, we are to some extent implicated as promoters of schism. There would, however, be a serious objection to removing them, now that they have obtained insertion, inasmuch as we should thereby appear to deny a doctrine which we in reality accept, although we might very well hold it without insisting upon this particular expression of it. And yet the Eastern Church may fairly require, as a condition of intercommunion, that we shall cease to recite this unauthorized addition, although it may not object to the substitution of some note, or explanatory rubric, affirming the doctrine. There is another change, in the version of this Creed commonly used by us, which appears to be due originally simply to carelessness, I mean the omission of the word "Holy" found both in the Greek and in the Latin originals, the notes of the true Church being that it is, *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic*.

In the olden time, Councils were the most powerful agents in maintaining the unity of the Church, and healing its divisions; and when the Pope summoned the Council now sitting at Rome, some persons hoped that its proceedings would tend to the promotion of this object; but such hopes must quickly have been dispelled, and instead of promoting unity it can scarcely fail to increase divisions. It arrogates to itself the title of Ecumenical, but absolutely excludes all who refuse submission to the See of Rome, and therefore only represents a section of the Catholic Church, and virtually its resolutions are those of the Italian Bishops, whose influence and numbers are irresistible. It may not be expected that the same harmony could prevail among the 700 assembled at Rome, as in the comparatively small assembly of 70 at Lambeth, but few probably were prepared for the violent antagonism of the two parties, and the spirit which has been evoked. What the ultimate consequences may be we cannot predict, but the papal system may not improbably receive a fatal shock. It is now demonstrated that the Pope is but an instrument in the hands of a clique, and that the whole Church is, through him, subjected to the control of "an aggressive

insolent faction," as it is truly designated by Dr. Newman ; so that the papal infallibility is practically the will of that faction. The claims, now put forth, are so arrogant and comprehensive as to be fraught with danger to all governments, and wholly incompatible with the enjoyment of freedom by any nation or community in which they are recognized, and consequently some of the most devoted adherents of the papacy have been compelled to protest against them. In doing this they have exposed the rottenness of the foundation, whereon the whole papal system is erected, and the frauds perpetrated by means of the spurious decretals, and other forged documents ; and what was before known only to students has now been published to the multitude.

The great difficulty, with which its supporters have to contend, is the "inexorable logic of facts," for if infallibility is an attribute of the so-called Chair of St. Peter, its occupant must always have been infallible ; but unfortunately for them, Popes have contradicted Popes, and some have undoubtedly held opinions at variance with the Catholic faith. An audacious attempt has been made to overcome this difficulty, by the daring assertion, that an appeal to History is treason to the Church, but although multitudes will close their eyes, and blindly receive whatever may be imposed upon them as an article of faith, there are still many who will refuse to do so. In the meantime, however, it is cheering to find that so many men of high standing have ventured boldly to speak the truth, notwithstanding the formidable array against them, and considering all the risks that they incur we must admit that they are worthy of the highest honor. Let us hope too, that the proceedings of the Council may have a good effect in repelling some of those who have been attracted by the false pretences and plausible arguments of Rome ; for after the revelations lately made, he must be infatuated indeed who can imagine that he may safely renounce our communion in favor of that Branch of the Church.

And now that there is an end to all hope of any such change on the part of Rome as might enable us to hold communion with her, since she has confirmed all her errors and corruptions, the eyes of those who long for unity, must turn more anxiously to the Greek Church, where we still venture to hope for such reforms, that we may no longer be separated by any irreconcilable differences. F

some reasons we may naturally look to the East rather than to Rome, and the conduct of the illustrious Eastern dignitaries, upon the receipt of the Pope's invitation to his Council, has greatly elevated them in the estimation of all who are not Romanists. The Eastern Churches are still in a depressed state, but by God's mercy they may be raised and quickened, being free from some of the most serious corruptions of the West.

The evils of divisions, and the importance of unity, are making themselves more and more felt by all denominations, and we hear of steps being taken for the re-union of the several divisions of the Presbyterians, Methodists, and others, and we cannot but hope, that in time they may be induced to proceed further, and that the congregations now separated may seek to be restored to Communion with the body, which originally rejected the Romish corruptions, from which they separated, the visible Church maintaining the doctrine and order of the Apostles, purified from the accretions of ages. Of God's great mercy, the Anglican Communion occupies that position, and we should be ready to do all in our power to facilitate such a re-union, provided we are not called upon to abandon any Catholic doctrine or practice. It must however be remembered that such overtures as have been made with a view to this end, have not been received in such a spirit as to afford much encouragement.

But the divisions most to be deplored, are those within our own Communion, for a House divided against itself cannot stand. These should cause great searchings of heart, and while we may sincerely thank God that in general brotherly love continues among ourselves in this Province, and the clergy work together as Ministers of one and the same Church, notwithstanding some inevitable diversities of opinion, we cannot be altogether unaffected by the serious differences prevailing in the mother country, and should be on our guard lest the infection spread here also. I say that differences of opinion are inevitable, because their origin is deeply seated in the constitution of man, and because in fact truth is many sided, and is presented in different aspects, according to the stand point from which it is viewed. We cannot doubt that the terms subjective and objective, now so familiar to us in connection with the controversies of the day, express the distinct aspects in which

persons appear naturally inclined to view the truth, and the differences may be for the most part traced to this bias.

The fact to be deplored then is, *not* that these differences exist, but that, ignoring this necessity, some want to compel every one else to adopt the opinions held by themselves. All appeal to the same Scriptures, and have pledged themselves to accept the same interpretation thereof, so far as it has been determined by the formularies of our Church, but that there is still considerable latitude allowed no one can deny, and it was evidently the intention of the compilers of our Prayer Book, and the framers of our other standards, to adopt a comprehensive system. Recognizing the principle which I have mentioned, they felt that, if the Church was to be indeed the body of Christ, it must comprise men holding divers opinions, because it is given to few to discern and embrace the *whole* truth, and if she were to exclude either side she would become a sect, forfeiting her claim to be a true branch of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

To some persons, the thought of any such comprehension is intolerable; they think it would be a betrayal of the truth to work with, or in any way to countenance, those who give prominence to views differing from their own. They will not admit, that the other side can be as honest as themselves, or that both may be right. In short they virtually assume personal infallibility, in their interpretations of Scripture, although they loudly condemn the arrogance and absurdity of such a claim, on the part of the Bishop of Rome. They probably are not at all aware of what they are really doing, they do not see what is involved in their assumption that because they have carefully examined a disputed question, and are fully convinced in their own minds, they must therefore be certainly right, and that moreover they who differ from them must be wrong. And observe there are two questions to be determined in each case 1st. Whether we ourselves are certainly right, and 2nd. Whether they who differ from us are therefore wrong; for this is involved in the fact of the double aspect of the truth, that both may be *right* as well as both *wrong*. Let those who doubt this consider the case of St. Paul and St. James. Would any one reading the Epistle of the former believe that their author agreed with the latter, if he knew nothing more of the writers than he could infer from these

letters? And yet we know that both wrote under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and we cannot doubt that they held and inculcated the self-same truth, although they may have looked at it from opposite sides.

Now there are at the present time, or are supposed to be, in the Church of England, two great Divisions or Schools of theology, the one holding more or less the sacramental theory, as it is called, and the other repudiating it. These are by some persons supposed to be diametrically opposed, the one to the other; and upon a superficial view they may appear to be so, but when more closely examined they are found to harmonize to a great extent, and to be in fact the complement the one of the other, so that, if either set of opinions were to be excluded, the truth would only be partially held in the Church. There had been, as we are compelled to admit, to our shame, a long period of extreme coldness, or we may say deadness, in our Church, which was interrupted by the good Providence of God, when the spirits of some pious men were stirred within them, and the truths almost forgotten were by *their* efforts brought to light and enforced. These men naturally first gave attention to what appeared to be fundamental truths, with respect more particularly to the Atonement, and the operations and influence of the Holy Spirit. The relation of the individual soul to God, and His work in it, were then so exclusively regarded, that the Church as a corporate body was overlooked, and the fact was ignored that Christ had established upon earth, a visible kingdom, with its offices and ordinances, and that this organisation was to be perpetual. For a long period, the party originated by these good men comprised within itself the greater part of the earnestness and devotion of the age, and there was little life beyond its limits; but at length it was perceived that, although they held and taught evangelical truth so far as they went, they were not preaching the *whole* of the Gospel. Truths long hidden were brought to light, and they who had discovered the defect in the then prevalent teaching were, in their turn, tempted to attach undue importance to their discoveries, and repeated the errors of their predecessors, by supposing that *they* now had the whole truth, and that their opponents were altogether wrong. The Church and the Ministry and the Sacraments were the topics, upon which they almost exclusively

insisted, treating with contempt, or denying, the truths which did not appear at first sight to harmonize with those most prized by themselves. This was the natural reaction from the opposite extreme, and equally defective; but now the true relative position of these two parties appears to be discerned, and some of the most devoted, holy, and zealous, men are conspicuous for their adoption of the sentiments of both, blending together, in one harmonious system, doctrines and practices which were held to be opposed, or at the least to be inconsistent the one with the other.

This process, it may be observed, has not been restricted to Theology, it has been and is adopted in other matters also, parties being amalgamated and old division lines effaced, so far that it may be regarded as one of the characteristics of this age. The maxim inculcated by the grand old heathen philosopher, is now adopted as a practical rule, that truth is ever to be found in a mean between two extremes, not necessarily equi-distant, but somewhere between them. This maxim appears to hold good in all probable matter, and is a very useful practical guide, for we are led by it to shun extremes, and are compelled to beware of attaching ourselves to any party, knowing that a party, as such, is avowedly in error, holding only part of the truth. At the same time, we must be prepared, if we attempt to act upon this principle, to be assailed by both of the parties from whom we stand aloof, and to be charged by each with a near approximation to the other, for viewed from either extreme, the mean will commonly appear itself to be in the other extreme. That we shall not in any case individually discover the exact mean, is more than probable, for we all through human infirmity are likely to have an undue tendency to one side or the other, but adopting this principle and endeavouring to act upon it, we may hope to approach near to the truth, if not strictly to attain to it. The two great parties to which I have referred, each include many earnest and pious men, who are estranged, chiefly through a misapprehension of each other's teaching; and I propose briefly to examine their respective positions, that we may see how they really stand, and whether there are actually such differences, as may justify either party in separating themselves from their brethren, who minister in the same Church, under the same vows and obligations.

The one party charge the others with attaching too much importance to externals, to the due order of the Ministry, and to the Sacraments, while they are themselves supposed, by those others, to rely too much upon frames and feelings, disregarding the appointed means of grace, lightly esteeming the Holy Sacraments, and generally treating with little respect the system organised and established upon the earth by the inspired Apostles. Now there are unquestionably extreme men, on both sides, who can never be brought to a mutual understanding who although they may subscribe to, and use the appointed forms of the Church, are by no means satisfied, are constantly wishing for alterations; but there are very many more who honestly and strictly adhere to her teaching, although they may somewhat differ in their acceptance of it.

I am bound to assume that you have all, my Reverend Brethren, well considered these matters, and require no further instruction from me, and yet I have reason to think that you may wish me *officially* to set forth what I hold to be the teaching of our Church upon the disputed points, for by this we all acknowledge our obligation to be governed. From the call of Abraham, there has ever been in the world a visible Church, a family or body bearing a peculiar relation to God, of which all the members are described as possessing certain privileges, and bound by special obligations. Within this body there have been at all times bad and good, tares and wheat, but, whether admitted by circumcision or by baptism, all have been addressed and treated as distinct from the world, whether for salvation, or for condemnation on account of aggravated guilt. It is admitted by all, that the existence of such a divine organisation is assumed in our Church system, and the question is; what position is assigned to her Ministers and her Ordinances?

With respect to the former, Episcopal ordination is insisted upon as an essential qualification, so far that the most able and pious Minister, coming from any non-Episcopal body, must be ordained before he can be permitted to officiate, while an Episcopally ordained man, from a corrupt branch of the Church, may be received upon renouncing his errors. This is because she holds the doctrine of Apostolical succession, which, frequently misunderstood and misrepresented, means simply that no one can have authority

to act as an ambassador for Christ, except from *Christ* himself, that all authority is derived from Him, that it was given when the christian ministry was instituted on the day of the resurrection, and has been transmitted through successive generations in due order.' The Bishop therefore, in ordaining, does not confer original authority, but only acts instrumentally, handing on that which has been received by himself. The admission that this succession may be of no consequence or may have been broken would imply, either that a man may give a commission to a fellow creature to act for God, or that, as some consistently maintain, there is *not* now in the Church any distinct order of Ministers. If then we would be free from the presumption of assuming that prerogative of the Head of the Church, we must hold that all ministers derive their authority solely from *His* institution. It is sometimes maintained that every man is truly an ambassador for Christ, who supposes himself to be moved by the Holy Spirit to take upon Him that office; but we reply that God is not the author of confusion, that a visible Church requires visible ordinances, that He has instituted a certain order or mode of appointment, and that, if departing from it, He should send special messengers, if He should really call any one to act without a formal commission, He would doubtless supply such evidences of that call, as would remove all doubt from the mind of his faithful people. I cannot understand how any man, having regard to the character of the functions which he is to discharge, can lightly regard this matter. Can it be supposed, that every one is at liberty to minister the Holy Sacraments, that every one may preach the Word? Probably in most of our congregations there is to be found some one better qualified than the Minister himself, by ability and knowledge of the Scriptures and fluency of speech, to occupy the Pulpit. By what right do you claim the attention of such men, or require them to respect your teaching? Is it not on account of your divine commission, because you come to them with a message from God? He who is appointed by the congregation, as a matter of convenience, to be their leader, to superintend their devotions, and to expound to them from time to time the word of God, can never be more than their servant. He may be in many ways a very useful man, but he is not an ambassador.

ambassador for Christ, and there is no trace of such an appointment in the Scriptures. The solemn form by which we were ordained Priests was, either a reality or an imposture, if the *latter* then it was a profane and blasphemous mockery, and no man who so regards it can act under the authority so conferred, without imminent peril to his soul. If the former, then having received the ministry of reconciliation, we must feel that we speak, not merely as man to man, but as though God did beseech them by us, that when we bless in the name of the Lord, when we proclaim pardon to the penitent, we speak not of ourselves, but as the special messengers of Him who hath called and sent us.* When again we warn the wicked, and endeavor to awaken the sleepers, to arouse the careless, and to lead them to flee from the wrath to come, we do this as watchmen, who have been charged to perform this duty, of whom if we neglect it, the blood of those who perish will be required. And we are bound to exhibit our credentials, to make our people understand their nature. It is neither humility nor modesty, but a gross dereliction of duty, and an affront to Him who hath called us to so high a dignity, to refrain from referring our authority to Him, and clearly explaining the ground upon which alone we can presume to exercise it. In any case, *this* surely must be admitted, that no one of us can be justified in exercising our Ministry, without a clear persuasion of the grounds on which we do so, without having thoroughly examined, and satisfied ourselves, so as to be able clearly to explain to others the nature of the Christian ministry, as distinct from the multitude of those who compose the body of Christians. Abandon your position, as holders of a commission received by uninterrupted succession from Christ himself, and no other will be found capable of being defended, against those who pretend that there are no officers in Christ's Kingdom upon earth, that there is not to be a distinct order of men set apart to minister in holy things, but that every Christian may perform these functions, if he conceives himself to be moved by the Holy Ghost to do so, without any examination of the reality of his call, or any visible seal.

We admit that every believer is a Priest, that the whole body collectively are a "royal priesthood, an holy nation;" and we would

* See Appendix B.

that this truth were more fully understood and realized. All are to "offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," and to "shew forth the praises of Him, who hath called us out of darkness into His marvellous light." Our Church specially provides for the exercise of this Priesthood, by requiring the assembled congregation to take an active part in a large portion of the public services, either uniting with the minister, or responding to his utterances. The Spirit dwells in them, and each one is a temple of the Holy Ghost, and we would have them ever remember their high calling; but it is not the less true, that it is according to the will of God now, as it was in the case of the Israelites, to whom these titles were originally applied, that certain persons shall be clothed with special authority to perform some of the functions of this Priesthood, and that, through the ministry of these persons, certain gifts and blessings are to be conveyed to the members of the *one* body.*

Concerning the Holy Sacraments, there ought to be little difference of opinion among the ministers of our Church; for, supposing that there may be room for doubt as to the teaching of the Scriptures, *she*, it is certain, has adopted a definite interpretation thereof, which we are bound to accept and to teach. We hold that the written word is the one only infallible standard to which all teaching is to be referred, by which all must be tested; but the Lord, who has promised to be with his Church even to the end of the world, has thus provided for a living voice speaking dogmatically, and by comparison with this authoritative teaching we are to determine the true meaning of the Scriptures, where we have conflicting tenets deduced from them.† If after careful examination, looking

* Is there not reason to fear that they who refuse to recognize the Christian ministry may be guilty of the "gainsaying of Core" who with others "gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron, and said unto them, ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy every one of them, and the Lord is among them; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the Lord?"

† This sound principle was thus affirmed by Cranmer, in his last appeal:—"Touching my doctrine of the Sacrament, and other my doctrine of what kind soever it be, I protest that it was never my mind to write, speak, or understand anything contrary to the most holy word of God, or else against the Holy Catholic Church of Christ; but purely and simply to imitate and teach those things only which I had learned of the Sacred Scriptures and of the holy Catholic Church of Christ from the beginning, and also according to the exposition of the most Holy and learned fathers and martyrs of the Church."—*Cranmer Remains and Letters*—p. 272.

for the guidance of the Holy Spirit, we should be persuaded that her interpretation is erroneous, that it cannot be reconciled with the written word, with respect to essentials, we should then be bound at once to cease to officiate, to withdraw from the exercise of the ministry, if not immediately from her communion. Addressing you therefore as Ministers of the English Branch of the Catholic Church, I advisedly limit myself to a summary of her teaching, leaving the proof or refutation of it to be sought in Holy Scripture and in ancient authors.

With respect to baptism, I need only refer you to the familiar language of the Catechism, and the offices, more particularly of that for the reception of children who have been privately baptised which is so explicit, that it cannot possibly be explained away;—
 “This child being born in original sin and in the wrath of God is now, *by the laver of regeneration in baptism*, received into the number of the children of God, and heirs of everlasting life, for our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny his grace and mercy unto such infants, but most lovingly doth call them unto Him;” and the declaration after baptism is thus expressed, “this child is *by baptism* regenerate.”

The tone of the Articles is supposed to be lower than the Prayer Book; but *there* also we have a direct contradiction of the popular opinions in the statement* that “sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, &c. ;”† then particularly we have it affirmed, that baptism is *not* only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, and that it is a sign of regeneration or new birth. We may reasonably ask, whether any one, reading this language, could entertain a doubt for a moment about the teaching of the Church, if he were simply wishing to discover what is intended to be conveyed without any prejudice, can any one doubt that it involves the doctrine of baptismal regeneration? meaning thereby, *not* that the water acts as a charm, or that the minister can of himself impart to it any virtue, but that it is the instrument appointed by Christ himself, whereby a certain effect is to be produced, that they who receive it accord-

* Article XXV.

† See Appendix C.

ing to his institution are incorporated into Him the second Adam, and *thereby* acquire a right to the privileges of the Sons of God, of which they had been deprived by the sin of the first Adam, their father according to the flesh, and to all the benefits derived from the incarnation, the taking of the manhood into God.*

With respect to the other Holy Sacrament, I must enlarge a little, because this is the subject in our day of much controversy, and the divergence of opinions is very wide. Here again, we begin with the instruction provided for the children, and they who find the meat intended for babes too strong for them can scarcely suppose themselves sound members of the Church. We are told concerning the Lord's Supper, that therein the body and blood of Christ "are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful," and that "our souls are strengthened and refreshed by the body and blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the bread and wine." In the article we are taught, that "the Supper of the Lord is *not* only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another." That is to say, it is not merely a love-feast, a bond of union, it is not as many suppose merely a celebration by uniting in which persons declare themselves members of a certain Society, there are certain blessings conveyed through it; "to such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ." In the office we are taught to pray "that we receiving the creatures of bread and wine may be partakers of the most blessed body and blood of Jesus Christ," "that we may so eat the flesh of Jesus Christ, and drink His blood that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His body and our souls washed through His most precious blood." And in the Homily we read, "this much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent."

Now if there is "no untrue figure of a thing absent," there must be a true or real presence. These words are by some supposed necessarily to imply the Romish doctrine, and the gross error of transubstantiation, but this is to be attributed merely to

their ignorance, for they confound *real* with *material*, being unable to conceive of any thing real which is not substantial, whereas the things which are not seen, which are spiritual, are most truly real. The doctrine of our Church, as now contained in her authoritative documents, the doctrine held by our reformers, and by the early Christian Fathers, is unquestionably that the faithful communicant does actually, though spiritually, partake of the body and blood of Christ,* that the bread and wine, having been consecrated, are made the vehicle for the conveyance to the communicant of that body and blood, of which it is written, "except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you."

Although the Church condemns the doctrine of transubstantiation, she does not by any means say that the consecration is a mere form, that these words are only rehearsed as declaratory of the purpose for which we meet together, having no effect upon the elements of bread and wine, and that those elements are precisely the same after as before. On the contrary, it is expressly ordered that, if any of the consecrated bread and wine remain, the Minister shall *reverently* place them upon the Table, covering the same with a fair linen cloth; and at the end, the Priest and other communicants shall *reverently* (observe the word again,) eat and drink the same; while, if there is not enough, the words of consecration are to be repeated over every additional portion of bread or wine before it can be administered. Why is this? Is it not because we believe that, whereas before consecration they are simply bread and wine, they are made after consecration the means of communicating to us the body and blood of Christ, so that we "spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood, we dwell in Christ and Christ in us." Hence they who eat and drink unworthily, who as St. Paul says do not discern the Lord's body, who do not distinguish between that which has been consecrated for this purpose and common food, eat and drink their own condemnation. Let us not enquire, "how can this man give us his flesh to eat," how in receiving the bread and wine we also receive the body and blood of Christ? Let us humbly and thankfully acknowledge His great goodness, believing His word, while we are compelled to confess that this is a great mystery, far beyond our comprehension, whatever theory may be adopted concerning it.

* See Appendix E.

Many persons entertain a strong prejudice against the use of the term "sacrifice," as applied to this Holy Sacrament; but it has been commonly so applied from the first. If it be used in any sense which implies a repetition of the one sacrifice, once for all offered upon the Cross, then it is to be condemned; and we utterly repudiate it, but there are several senses in which it may be used with propriety.* Thus the whole service is a sacrifice, as it is termed in the prayer after administration, "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." In the same prayer, the offering of our souls and bodies is spoken of as a "living sacrifice"—again we confess ourselves unworthy to offer any "sacrifice," but beseech Him to accept "this our bounden duty and service." Again the sacrifice *under the law* had no efficacy in themselves, for the blood of bulls and of goats could never put away sin, but they prefigured the one all-sufficient sacrifice, which was to be offered in the fullness of time, and as they may properly be called sacrifices, although only types and shadows of the one sacrifice, so may this representation specially endued with virtue so as to convey to us the benefit thereof, be still more correctly designated by that same term. Our Lord said, "do this for a memorial † of me" (for this, as you know, is a more exact rendering of His words than "in remembrance of me,") so that it is a representation before God and men of his sacrifice; and as St. Paul teaches us, "as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show or proclaim the Lord's death till he come." ‡ You need not be afraid of involving yourselves in Romish error, by the use of this word, unless you will insist upon restricting it to one only signification, and depriving it of the meaning which has been commonly attached to it. In fact few things are more favorable to Rome, than the habit of conceding to her the sole right to adopt language and practices which are found upon examination, to have been commonly used by the writers whose authority is highest in the Church of Christ, and particularly in our own Branch of it.

* See Appendix F.

† The word used by our Lord, conveys the ideas of commemoration and memorial, as well as remembrance. It may be noticed as a marked distinction between the two covenants, that under the Law of Moses there was a commemoration of sins; (Heb. x. 3,) while under the Gospel there is a commemoration of a Saviour from sin.—*Bickersteth on the Lord's Supper.*

‡ See Appendix G.

The idea of making before God a memorial of the sacrifice, may appear erroneous to those to whom it is not familiar, but we have only to ask them to consider a little, not to decide too hastily. Do we not all constantly use the expression pleading Christ's merits? pleading his sacrifice once offered upon the cross? What do we mean by this? Is it not, if we may so speak, recalling it to the memory of the Father, declaring that we rely upon it for acceptance with Him? Now it is very inconsistent, to maintain the propriety of pleading the sacrifice in words, and yet to deny that we may do so in act, that we may regard the breaking of the bread, the representation of the death of Christ, as pleading it in the most powerful manner,* making the most effective memorial, because it is that which has been specially prescribed by the Lord himself. He, having "by his own blood entered in once into the holy place," now appears "in the presence of God for us," and perpetually maketh intercession for us. He pleads his own sacrifice, and we, when we celebrate these holy mysteries, acknowledge *that* intercession. and entreat that it may be accepted for us.

And here it may be necessary to observe, that there is no reason to expect any benefit from this celebration, except through participation, through eating and drinking. The great feature of the Passover, was the eating the lamb that had been slain. The benefits of the sacrifice were appropriated to the individual, through feasting upon it. It is in *this*, as St. Paul says, that we shew the Lord's death. And he illustrates the effect upon *us*, by a reference to the Jews, "Behold Israel after the flesh, are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?" in like manner they who should eat of things sacrificed to devils, would have fellowship with devils, and they who are partakers of the consecrated bread and cup, being partakers of the Lord's Table, are partakers of Him whose sacrifice is there represented. The bread and the wine are made the body and blood of Christ, not absolutely but to *us*. Their substance is not changed, neither is there any union of the body of Christ with them. The natural body of Christ now

* What we more compendiously express in that general conclusion of our prayers, "through Jesus Christ our Lord," we more fully and forcibly represent in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, wherein we plead the virtue and merits of the same sacrifice here, that our great High Priest is continually urging for us in heaven.—*Bickersteth on the Lord's Supper.*

glorified, is in Heaven, and is always represented as being *there*, above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Moreover, if we were made partakers of the glorified body, we should not have the blood presented to us at all. In the Eucharist we have *that* body, through the sacrifice of which we obtain remission of sins,* we have separately the body and the blood which were separated upon the cross, the body which was broken, the blood there poured out. He who, by his Almighty power, enabled his Apostles to feed the multitude with a few loaves, still through the operation of the Holy Spirit, by the instrumentality of his appointed ministers, imparts to his faithful disciples that bread which came down from Heaven, even the body and blood once offered as an all-sufficient sacrifice upon the cross. But as our souls, not our bodies are to be nourished by the sacred food, therefore its spiritual qualities are imparted to us. These, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, are actually imparted to the faithful recipient, while from the wicked and those who are void of faith they are withheld. "The body of Christ is given, taken and eaten in the Supper after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten, is faith."

In the mass, it is held that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity of Christ, that is to say the whole Christ, are present in the consecrated wafer, and that these are actually offered as a sacrifice by the Priest; but *we* have no oblation *after* consecration. We however solemnly offer to God bread and wine, which are afterwards to be consecrated, and the omission by any Clergyman of this oblation, as ordered by the rubric, is inexcusable. The belief that the whole Christ is there locally present, circumscribed by the material elements upon the altar, and that He is actually offered, is unfounded, and all adoration based upon it is wrong. Yet there can be no doubt of the conclusion, derived from a careful examination of Holy Scripture, and of the early Christian writers, and of our own formularies, that, after the prayer and act of consecration, the bread and wine are, by the power of the Holy Ghost, endued with such virtue, that the faithful communicant does literally though spiritually feed upon Christ, having his soul truly strengthened and refreshed thereby.†

* See Appendix H.

† See Appendix I.

It may be deemed superfluous here to point out the error of those who imagine that they may beneficially be present at the celebration, although they refuse to communicate; but where the higher views of this Holy Sacrament are inculcated, it is necessary to warn also against the errors into which men, (being naturally inclined to run to extremes,) may be most likely to fall, through a perversion of the truth on *that* side. Now we know that, in England in some Churches, the whole congregation are urged to remain during the celebration, and that a custom is creeping in, even among those who have been regular communicants, of frequently remaining without communicating. But this is contrary to the spirit of the ancient constitutions; and, in the words of the Bishop of Salisbury,* “the only possible place which a faithful lay Christian, or I would add a priest not celebrating, can rightly have, when the Holy Eucharist is celebrated, is the place of a communicant. If there be reasons and causes personal to himself, why he should not on the particular occasion, communicate, the same reasonable causes require his absence from the celebration.” S. Chrysostom† rebuked those who thus remained without partaking, “in vain is the daily sacrifice, in vain do we stand before the Altar, there is no one to partake, art thou not worthy of the sacrifice, nor of the participation? If so then neither art thou of the prayers. Thou hearest the herald standing, and saying, ‘as many as are in penitence all depart;’—as many as do not partake are in penitence. Every one that partaketh not of the mysteries, is standing here in shameless effrontery,” &c. A similar opinion was expressed by the venerated Keble,‡—in a letter written not long before his death, and although we cannot eject any who choose to remain, and it may be desirable that Candidates for confirmation or others intending to become communicants, should be present before being actual partakers, I trust that you, my Rev. Brethren, will never sanction the attendance, during the celebration of the most Holy Sacrament, of a mixed congregation, of whom the majority may be practically self-excommunicated, nor encourage communicants, to delude themselves with the notion that they may be in almost as good a position,

* Moberly's Bampton Lectures, p. 180.

† Hom. iii. in Ephes. i. 15-20.

‡ See Appendix K.

when their consciences warn them not to draw near, as though they were regularly availing themselves of their christian privileges, that they may profitably be present, while neglecting to partake the sacrifice, in which they can only enjoy a direct personal participation by eating and drinking.

With respect to the frequency of celebration, this will depend very much upon the manner in which the Holy Sacrament is regarded. Where it is looked upon as little more than a profession of faith, the celebrations will of course be rare; but when it is rightly regarded they will be frequent. And provided they be not so multiplied, as to make it probable that the needful preparation will be wanting, they can hardly be too frequent, any more than the prayers can be. At all events, if we take for our guide the Scriptures, and the history of the primitive Church, we know that the breaking of bread was the primary object of the public assemblies of worship. It should therefore be a part of all our most solemn and special services, and a celebration regularly on the first day of every week, if not more frequently, should be as far as possible our rule. The mind of our Church, in this respect, is manifested in the rubric requiring that in Cathedrals and Colleges, where there are many Priests and Deacons, they shall all receive with the Priest every *Sunday at the least*. The objections raised to the practice would be unaccountable, if we were not aware that, whenever there is an awakening, whenever an improvement is introduced upon long existing practice, many persons are sure to oppose without examination or reflection, merely because they do not like the old customs to be changed, especially if the change appears to require them to take more trouble than before, or to do more than they had been in the habit of doing. Thus, where the Communion had only been celebrated four times in the year, the introduction of a *monthly* communion has been violently opposed, and the introducer has been charged with the adoption of grievous errors, while those who have been accustomed to a monthly celebration are inclined to condemn their brethren who have ventured upon a weekly communion. This much is certain, that nothing less than a weekly celebration is in accordance with Scriptural rule; and I am thankful that in several Parishes, even where there are two or three Churches, this rule is adopted, by celebrating the Holy Communion

every Sunday in that Church which has the morning Service. That there are still a few, where there are only from four to six celebrations in the year, I am sorry to see; but the list is steadily decreasing, and I hope that the annual returns will soon shew that in most, if not all, of the Parishes in this Diocese, both Clergy and Laity feel that the Holy Communion is the great act of Christian worship, is the chief object for which Christians should assemble together, is so great a blessing that they will be anxious to enjoy this their high privilege as often as may be possible. If it be found that your people are so ignorant, or so perverse, as to insist that the practice of weekly Communion is unwarranted, or betokens a tendency towards extreme opinions, it may be well to circulate John Wesley's Sermo upon this subject, which, written by him in early life, was revised and republished only two years before his death, and is therefore the expression of his matured judgment.* It is worthy of note too, that the celebrated Anabaptist preacher, whose disciples in London are so numerous, advocates, and has adopted, weekly Communion, and that a modern sect of Christians, who more than any others have rejected Catholic tradition, have been constrained by the plain words of the Scriptures, to adopt the practice of meeting together to break bread, on the first day of every week.

There is another point on which, although I referred to it in my last charge, I cannot refrain from adding a few observations. I mean the character of the services, and the arrangements and ornaments of our Churches. Our opinion, of the manner in which these should be ordered, will be greatly influenced by our opinions with respect to worship, which as I then observed appears to be little understood. The question is, are we to regard our public assemblies as designed, solely or chiefly for our own benefit and edification, or rather for the honor of God? The low view regards self more particularly, and considers chiefly what good *self* is to derive, and consequently anything beyond the customary Sunday service is lightly esteemed, regarded as a work of supererogation, or as favoring of formalism and of too much attention to externals. It is found that the soul is more excited, and therefore as it is supposed more beneficially affected, in private devotion, or in

* See Appendix I.

social prayer meetings, than in the public services, and therefore attendance in the House of God is not thought of, except upon the Sunday, and *then* too frequently the Sermon is much more the attractive power than the promise of the Saviour's presence where two or three are gathered together in His name. But where there is any adequate apprehension of the true nature of worship, when it is understood and felt that the glory of God is first to be regarded in our assembling together, then our feelings concerning it must all be influenced accordingly. Then it is felt that the daily service, as ordered by our Church, ought to be adopted as far as may be; that it should in fact be the rule and not, as unhappily it now is, the exception. He is honored by the public assembly, and due homage is rendered to Him by the attendance in the House of Prayer, in a manner in which it cannot be rendered by any other means, notwithstanding any benefit that the individual may derive from the use of those means. In the long season of darkness, with which our Mother Church was afflicted, when the spiritual life was nearly extinguished, the daily service was almost unknown except in Cathedrals and Colleges, but now it has been in many places restored; and although the circumstances of some Parishes in this Diocese are such that it cannot generally be introduced, I hope that you will all bear in mind that it is the practice, at which we ought to aim, and that, whenever it may be possible, you will introduce it, or will approach as near to it as you can.

Then with respect to the style and decoration of our Churches, and the character of the services, if we discern that worship is to be our great object, we shall desire to have everything in harmony with it. The Building erected for the glory of God will shew that our own accommodation has not been primarily considered. An expenditure, which we might well grudge for ourselves, will be cheerfully lavished upon it, by those who have the spirit whereby David was influenced, when he prepared great store for the Temple, because the palace was not for men but for the Lord God, and the services will bear the same character. Many things may be appropriate, and even requisite, for worship in its most perfect earthly form, which would be unsuitable if we were only to regard the assembly as gathered together for confession, and supplication, and hearing the word preached, for their own benefit.

The opinions and intentions of our Reformers and the compilers of our Prayer Book, in this matter, are to be inferred from the character of the services adopted as the type, as their ideal of what public worship *ought* to be, and for the maintenance whereof provision was made in the Cathedral or Mother Church of each Diocese, so that the choral service has been continued twice on each day throughout the year. It is moreover to be noted, that several portions of the service, which are commonly read, ought if possible to be sung, thus the Creeds and even the Litany are to be "sung or said," *not* "said or sung." Try then to elevate the thoughts of your people, that they may be influenced by a right spirit, that their hearts may be raised above selfish considerations, and they may humbly endeavour to imitate the heavenly host who, having nothing to gain, no occasion for prayer, yet are occupied with unceasing worship.

But while worship is first to be regarded, while we honor God, we also are permitted to look for blessings for ourselves, and in this respect there is room for difference of opinion. In practice, one man finds his affections enlivened, and his heart stirred within him, by external aids such as music and singing, and would have as much of them as can be introduced into our services; to another these are distasteful. One prefers singing hymns in metre, another prefers chanting, one finds that he is aided, in his endeavors to banish earthly thoughts and to rise heavenward, when he worships in a building, whereof all the features are peculiar and free from all worldly associations; of which all the ornaments remind him that we ought to devote to God's service the very best that we have, while another thinks that he is hindered by these same things, and that he can be more devout in the simplest and most homely structure. To some, there appears to be no solemnity in a service, which is not also dull and heavy; while others think the services should be as cheerful as possible, full of life and spirit.* Let not the one condemn the other; each may rightly endeavor to secure

* Must worship be dull in order to be spiritual? To render it acceptable to God, must it be destitute of every element that might render it attractive to man? Is the divinely bestowed faculty of a good ear, a correct eye, a taste for beauty, in godly people, to be ignored in religion, because others who are not godly might thus be induced to join in an outward worship, with the inner meaning of which they have as yet no sympathy?—*Newman Hall*.

for himself what he finds to be most beneficial, provided he does not attempt to debar others from the exercise of the same privilege ; but no one can be justified in condemning those whose tastes and feelings differ from his own. To do so is a sure sign of a very narrow mind, and conclusively proves the absence of that charity, which is the “bond of peace, without which whosoever liveth is counted dead before God.”

We hear much, in these days, of “ritualism,” and to speak of a man as a ritualist is enough to condemn him, without further enquiry, in the minds of some persons. This arises from a lax use of words, without due regard to their meaning, for we cannot have a body of men uniting in any public service or ceremony without “ritualism.” Each denomination of Christians has its own ritual, or order of services, to which it strictly adheres, and from which in general no departure is permitted. Every minister therefore who conscientiously adheres to the ritual or rule prescribed by the body to which he belongs, may be called a ritualist. But when used as a term of reproach, it is probably intended to signify, that undue importance is attached to externals, or that unauthorised rites and ceremonies are practised. And no one will object to the definition that, “whatever in the sacred and solemn worship of God, comes between the soul of man, and his Almighty Father and his Redeemer in heaven, in such a way as not to elevate and raise his feeble faculties, towards the contemplation of the Eternal and Supreme, but to bar him from it, *that* is ritualism in a bad sense.”* Here then, issue may be joined as to the propriety of the epithet in each particular case, observing that propriety is two-fold, absolute and relative. What is good absolutely, may not be so in relation to something else. A ritual, highly to be commended in itself, may be unlawful where it is unsanctioned by recognized authority, or it may be so objectionable in itself that no sanction can justify it. We have a ritual provided for us, and being satisfied that it contains nothing essentially wrong we are bound strictly to observe it ;—no minister is at liberty to omit any practice thus enjoined, because he does not see the use of it. But there are some things, for which no directions are given, some practices simply derived from custom

* Speech of the Right Hon. W. Gladstone.

or tradition, and in these there is room for diversity of practice. Nevertheless the Clergy are not left each to his own discretion, for the Prayer Book orders recourse to be had to the Bishop, whenever there is diversity of opinion concerning the manner of doing and executing the things contained in it. This wholesome rule is despised on both sides, and the offenders are so numerous that the Bishops are powerless, because they cannot as honest and impartial men proceed against those who transgress, on the one side, or on the other, by additions or by omissions, unless they are prepared to enforce a rigid uniformity, without respect of persons or of parties. Thus for example while some of the Clergy persist in practising the unauthorized ceremony of changing the vestments, going out of the Church, and substituting black for white, in the middle of the Service, and on the other hand habitually omit the positively ordered ceremony of offering bread and wine at the appointed time, the Bishop cannot check those who may add to, or detract from, the ceremonial in other respects, which may be deemed more objectionable.

Again some persons object to symbolism altogether, in theory, I say *in theory*, because the most decided objectors are unable to keep clear of it in practice. It is natural to man, the rudest and the most cultivated nations alike make use of it. We are surrounded by it, and have to do with it in our every day life. The coin with which we procure the necessities of life, the flag under which we live, the constable's staff, these are symbols; and when we pass from earthly things to heavenly, we perceive that everything must more or less partake of the nature of a symbol, for spiritual things can only be understood by earthly illustrations. The Bible is replete with symbolism, and he who would exclude it from our public worship would abandon one of the most powerful aids to devotion, one of the most useful modes of enabling men to comprehend and realize the invisible things of the spiritual world. The only question is therefore whether the symbolism be appropriate, and whether it is in conformity with the spirit of our services, whether its use is likely to lead to error or to truth, to suggest false doctrine, or to facilitate the comprehension of divine mysteries. Extreme ritualism is in fact an excessive use of symbolism bringing discredit upon what in itself is good and profitable.

But we require to be frequently reminded of the self-evident axiom, that the use of any good thing is not to be abandoned or condemned, in consequence of its abuse. At the same time I heartily endorse the condemnation of those who are endeavoring to introduce, or to restore, Romish practices, simply because they are Roman, although they know how great a prejudice exists in the minds of many against everything derived from that source; for it must be admitted that this prejudice is not in itself without foundation, and we only deprecate it when it would deprive us of what is essentially good, merely because it has been held among many corruptions. It is equally foolish to introduce as it is to reject, any doctrine or practice, merely because it has a place in the Roman system. It is the part of wise men to judge everything upon its merits. If it comes from a suspected source, there is therefore reason for more careful enquiry and examination, but not for rejection. Let us “prove all things and hold fast that which is good.”

Objection to change is in itself laudable, but it is worse than childish to reject or condemn an improvement, merely because it is new to us. If that principle were to be adopted in earthly things, there would be an end to progress. To persist in adhering to what *is*, merely because it *is*, is only less objectionable than change for the sake of change. Such a course is at least inconsistent with the character of this 19th century, in which though its claim to enlightenment may be exaggerated, there is certainly a spirit of enquiry, a general inclination to try everything upon the merits, an appreciation of truth, and a dislike to shams; our principles must be firmly maintained, and we would steadily walk in the old paths, but in the application of these principles we may profit by experience; and the habits and tendencies of our age may require a modification of what was well adapted for another period. We are sometimes asked when a change is made in any of the detail of our services, why we do not continue in the old way, and very frequently the proper answer is *this*, either that some thing has been suggested, which being proposed, has commended itself as worthy of adoption, although its propriety had previously been

overlooked,* or that the accustomed mode had crept in through ignorance or carelessness, and is unauthorised or incorrect, but that now enquiries have been instituted and light thrown upon the subject, so that the plea of ignorance is no longer available. Every Clergyman it may be added is bound by his solemn pledges, when the right way has been pointed out to him, to follow it, and to cease from doing what is no longer excusable, when he knows that it is wrong, since wherever there are two ways of doing anything we are bound to follow the right, if we can discover it, even in minor matters.

While speaking of the mode of conducting our services, I would especially beg you yourselves to set an example of reverence. The want of reverence is a crying evil of our age, let us at least do our part towards preserving it in the Sanctuary, even if it should not be found elsewhere. The best security for this, will be to have our own hearts deeply impressed with the solemnity of the acts, in which we are engaged, remembering in whose presence we stand, in *whose* worship we are to be leaders of the Congregation. Some Clergymen act as if they were merely supervisors of the assembly, as though they were to see that the Congregation do right in all respects, without regard to their own position before God; whereas we ought rather to be absorbed in our own consciousness of the majesty of Him whom we are approaching, and while drawing near to Him, to think but little of those who are assembled with us.

Especially I have to speak of the reverence due to the Holy Table, for in the course of my visits I am frequently pained by seeing it used as a common shelf or resting place, and while this is the case, it is vain to expect that the people will rightly regard the Table of the Lord, or the holy Sacrament there celebrated. This obligation does not depend upon any particular views, or upon the adoption of any theory. According to the lowest view of the Supper of the Lord, it is still the highest rite of the Christian

* Thus for example, when several persons have to take part in a solemn ceremony, or even to enter a sacred Building, it is manifestly proper that they should walk in regular order, or in other words, that there should be a procession. At funerals this rule has been generally adopted, and our common sense leads us to the conclusion, that it ought to be observed on other occasions also, if all things are to be "done decently and in order," and that there can be no reasonable objection to such processions, in themselves.

Church, the privilege to be enjoyed by its most faithful members. The Table is the Lord's, and therefore surely is not to be treated with less respect than we should manifest in the use of a Table belonging to a fellow-creature. Upon it are placed, and from it are distributed, the bread and wine, through participation in which the faithful communicants are, *by all*, believed to receive some spiritual blessings. And it may not be amiss to remind you, that the common expression "communion table" is incorrect, and perhaps tends to encourage wrong views, for it may imply that it is in some respect appertaining to man. It does indeed occur in the Title of a Canon, but in the Prayer Book we have always, the "Lord's Table," or simply the Table.

I have enlarged upon some points on which opinions differ, giving you the aspect in which they are presented to those who would commonly be classed as high Churchmen, because the opinions of those who are so called, are least understood, and at the present time have most need to be enforced; because moreover, from our position as a small body, among a large population by whom the dogmatic teaching of the Catholic Church is rejected, that teaching is likely to be lightly regarded by ourselves; and through association with *them*, the tendency against which we have especially to guard, if we would hold the truth, is altogether towards that one side. But I desire also to direct your attention to matters on which the other School lay most stress, and to truths of which they suppose themselves to be the exclusive advocates. By the one School, our position as members of a *body*, in our relation to the whole organisation, is more particularly regarded; by the other our state as *separate* members, and the latter is, to say the least, as important as the former. If the branch can only bear fruit as part of the vine, on the other hand it may be still attached to the root, and nevertheless be withered or dead. The withered limb is only fit to be cut off, and separated actually from the body, whence it derives no nourishment. *They* are right therefore in preaching the necessity for conversion, in the case of the baptised, who have gone astray, who have wandered from their father's house, as much as for those who have never been adopted as his children. They rightly dwell upon the need for each one, of the work of the Holy Spirit, upon the necessity for a personal experience of the love of

God shed abroad in the heart, and for a consciousness of peace, produced by a belief that our sins have been borne by Christ, that we are ourselves accepted in the beloved. They insist in harmony with the Articles, upon the corruption of our nature, and the impossibility of doing "good works pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us, that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will." They jealously oppose anything approaching to a claim of merit, on the part of man, magnifying the free grace of God, and His love manifested in our redemption, "in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." Above all they insist upon the power of faith, and its office in giving effect to all the means of grace, and maintaining the union between Christ and the soul.

In this *positive* teaching *they* are quite right, and we are all bound plainly and unequivocally to inculcate it, but they are wrong in *stopping* here, they err, when they maintain that this is the whole of the truth, and deny that other portions of it are also to be held by those who are going on to perfection, desiring as far as possible to become acquainted with, and to uphold, the whole counsel of God. They are above all wrong, when they assume that these truths are ignored or rejected by those who differ from them with respect to other parts of the divine revelation.

Let us try then, my Brethren, to emancipate ourselves from the bondage of party. To some persons this is much more difficult, than to others. It is so much more easy to speak and act with a party, than to form an independent judgment, and adopt an independent course, without reference to the praise or blame of men. He who will not do so, is very likely to be regarded with suspicion by all, but truth is to be sought out and to be maintained at any cost, and we may be sure, that the system which the Lord has been pleased to provide for us, must be attended with benefits, which cannot be so certainly obtained under any other, and that we ought to adopt it in its integrity, not arbitrarily selecting certain portions as important, to the disparagement of others, but trying to give its due place to every doctrine, and every practice, teaching according to the proportion of the faith.

Some of you have unhappily to deal with a large number of persons, who have not been baptised, and you can have no difficulty

in determining how *they* are to be addressed ; but more commonly we have to do with those, who have been by baptism separated from the world, included among the number called to be saints, of whom nevertheless many are dead in trespasses and sins, or at all events destitute of any tokens of spiritual life. Wherefore, if you would be instrumental in saving their souls, you must be no less urgent, than you would be with the Heathen. You must plainly set forth the need of an entire change, in the inner man as well as in the outward behaviour. You must try to lead them to such a conviction of their wretchedness, that they may act in the spirit, and after the example, of the younger son described in the parable. While we set forth with the utmost clearness the privileges enjoyed by the baptised, we must be no less clear in setting forth, the increase of guilt and condemnation resulting from them. The right teaching of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is so far from being opposed to what is commonly known as Evangelical preaching that it adds fresh force to it. It is based upon the corruption of human nature and man's inability to do anything acceptable to God, except by the grace of God. If there were any innate good, any germ which might in time be developed by culture, the Sacraments would not be so essential ; but believing that man, ruined and degraded in Adam, can only be restored and elevated in Christ, we can apprehend the necessity for some mode, by which we may be definitely incorporated into Him, that so we may be actually " members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones." We discern the exercise of love, and of God's free grace, in the appointment of a mode whereby the infant subject to condemnation, without any act of its own, may in like manner be delivered from the curse, placed in a state of salvation. We can appeal to the baptised, as we cannot to the Heathen. All the arguments used in the Epistles, having been in the first place addressed to the baptised, to those who had been regenerated by water and the Holy Ghost, are deprived of much of their force, when the regeneration of the hearers is not recognised.* Because the baptised have been incorporated into the second Adam, therefore we may urge that they must glorify God, because being bought with a price they are not their own, because they are the temples

* See Appendix M.

of the Holy Ghost, who is striving with them, who will be grieved by their hardness and impenitence. We must ever be preaching Christ, and must take heed that we do not lead our flocks to rely upon any ordinances, as if they could be in themselves effectual, we must ever teach that they are valuable only because Christ has appointed them, because He works through them, and that only so far as He does so work can they have any force. If we interpose them between the soul and Christ, then indeed our teaching must be baneful, as it must be also on the other hand if, assuming to be wiser than God, we treat them as of little consequence, or as though we should be more truly spiritual, without any outward ordinances at all. But if we exalt them, as the divinely appointed instruments, whereby union with Christ is to be inaugurated and maintained, according to His own appointment, ever directing the recipient to look through them to Christ, to strive to realise *His* presence, and *His* operation, to discern *Him* in them, our people will be safely led on to higher views, and enabled to reap the full benefit of the holy ordinances provided for them.

Withal let the absolute need of faith, and the power of faith, as the essential condition on which all their efficacy depends, be strenuously reiterated, for faith without the Sacraments, where they are not to be had, may avail, but the Sacraments without faith, in those who are capable of exercising it, will profit nothing. Our great difficulty is, that men do not understand how much is implied in faith. It has to do with the mysteries of the kingdom of God; the faithful should, by the exercise of faith, be living as subjects of a kingdom, which is not of this world, beholding the things which are invisible. Faith ought not to be, as it too often is, engaged mainly upon *self*, taking in fact man's feelings, and condition as its objects. It should be occupied with the great facts and truths revealed to us, especially with Him who is in an especial manner the object of faith. "Our life is hid with Christ in God;" "the life which I live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God;" such expressions can only be used by one, who habitually looks out of himself and to Christ, who has regard to the body of which he is a member, of which Christ Himself is the head. The absence of such faith is the cause of the mistakes, made with respect to the Sacraments, because the natural eye, perceiving

only the outward and visible signs, sees nothing but empty forms, and faith alone can discern that they are instinct with life, that Christ is in them, and that they be "certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, by the which God doth work invisibly in us."

The popular system is in fact a system of salvation by works, although in theory opposed to an undue estimate of their value. In *it*, while human merit is repudiated in words, everything is made to depend upon personal qualifications, the feelings of the individual are much more regarded than the instruments used by Christ. The dwelling of the Spirit in the Church collectively, *there* working according to His own pleasure, "dividing to every man severally as He will," through the channels devised and appointed by Himself, is ignored. The eloquence of a preacher is regarded as much more effective than the Sacraments ordained by Christ, and men are encouraged to turn their eyes inwards upon themselves, relying upon their own feelings, instead of looking away from self, and solely to Christ. We must indeed enforce the need of self examination and of caution and watchfulness, but we must take heed that we do not foster a spirit of dependence upon self. While we speak of the love towards God, with which our hearts should be influenced, let us still more constantly set forth the magnitude of the love of God for us. Let us dwell upon the completeness of Christ's work, the perfection of the atonement, which only requires to be applied to the individual soul, and of which every *living* member of Christ's body enjoys the benefit.

If we have many discouragements, we have also much to cheer us. There are unequivocal signs, of the life-giving presence of the Holy Spirit moving in the Church. "God waiteth to be gracious," let us not through our own carelessness lose the proffered blessings, let us see to it, that we do not neglect any means, whereby our people may be awakened, and induced to shake off the apathy and lukewarmness, which are so prevalent and yet so dangerous. If we, in the strength of the Lord, seeking the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, use the right means to influence those committed to our care, may we not hope that there will be a shaking among the dry bones, and a true revival in this portion of the field?—Be not content with public preaching, although this, when earnest and

faithful is a powerful engine, but also seek after the individual members of your congregations, that you may apply to them severally, as may be required, the wholesome medicine of the Gospel. Many will welcome you, if only you will speak unto them smooth things and prophecy deceits, but beware lest, administering opiates where stimulants are required, you promote the tendency to slumber from which there may be no awakening. If you persist, in striving to raise your people above the ordinary low standard, you must encounter opposition, but although there may be many adversaries, this is better than a state of indifference. You have no cause for rejoicing, that you have well conducted, regular, and attentive, congregations unless there be spiritual life among them. Oh, my brethren remember ever, that *souls* are depending upon you, souls for which Christ died. Leave no legitimate method untried, by which they may be influenced. This was the Spirit of the Apostle Paul, who was "made all things, to all men, that he might by all means save some." Some may be moved in one way, and some in another. Some of you may be very successful in one way, who would be hampered by adopting the mode which has been found most effectual by another. Work each one, as God guides you, as God gives you power. Only be in earnest; only shew that you have the right object at heart, and whether your mode may be that which I should myself prefer or not, you may reckon most certainly upon my sympathy and support. It is my earnest prayer that each one, thus laboring for Christ's sake, may reap an abundant harvest, may be cheered by manifest tokens that his labor is not in vain in the Lord.

Finally, Reverend Brethren, while we teach others, let us always include ourselves among the hearers. Let us beware of the great danger, to which we are ever exposed, and of which we cannot be too frequently warned, of self-deception, of being satisfied with a sort of official piety, as a substitute for personal holiness. Let us bear in mind the warning note, so clearly sounded in our ears, and so earnestly repeated, by our Brother in his Sermon last night, that "as is the Angel so is the Church." We ought to be able to speak, from our own experience, of a higher Christian life than that which is lived by our lay brethren, who are occupied with the business, and distracted by the bustle of this

world. We too have our cares and anxieties; but we ought to be able, so to cast our burden upon the Lord, and so to live as Citizens of Heaven, having our heart and our treasure *there*, that all men may see that our preaching is not in word only, that we mean what we say, that we do literally "count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus our Lord." The time is short. God grant unto us grace and power so to work while it is called to-day, that we may not be liable to the condemnation of the slothful servant, that we be not chargeable with the loss of souls, who might have been saved by greater diligence and fidelity and self-denial on our part, but that we may "finish our course with joy, and the ministry which we have received of the Lord Jesus to testify the Gospel of the grace of God," that so when He "the chief Shepherd shall appear," we may "receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away."

APPENDIX.

THE following extracts are not given, as the most convincing that can be found, or as furnishing a complete series of authorities for the opinions enunciated in the text. On the contrary, most of the great well known writers, from the Apostolical Fathers, downwards, are omitted, and these few quotations have been selected, as examples of the substantial agreement, of men of different schools, in their expressions, when they undertake to write definitely upon these subjects.

NOTE A. PAGE 26.

There are in existence, catalogues of Bishops from our own time back to the day of Pentecost. These catalogues are proofs of the importance always attached by the Church to a regular genealogy in her Bishops. It has been well remarked, that Christ Jesus has taken more abundant care to ascertain the succession of pastors in his Church, than ever was taken in relation to the Aaronical priesthood. For in this case the succession is transmitted from seniors to juniors, by the most public and solemn action, or rather series of actions, that is ever performed in a Christian Church.—*Hook's Church Dictionary.*

Ordination we esteem, scarcely less than does the Church of Rome, as an appointment of Christ Himself. We believe, that God gives grace for the office of the Ministry to those who receive it aright. We observe that, though our Lord commanded no particular sign, yet the Apostles always used the laying on of hands. But with regard to the inward grace, we read not, that forgiveness of sins or personal sanctification were promised to its right reception, but rather the Holy Ghost *for the work of the Ministry.*—*Browne on Art. xxv.*

Jesus Christ delegated authority in his spiritual Empire, not to Kings or other civil magistrates, but to Apostles, as destitute as himself of all secular power, and as far from claiming any. His expressions imply, not merely a delegation of authority, but also that it was delegated, not to the Apostles alone, as individuals, but also to their successors the Bishops and pastors of the Church, whom they, under the direction of the Holy Spirit, ordained to fill those offices, and who have continued in *unbroken succession* down to the present day.—*Hugh McNeile's Letters to a friend, p. 21.*

In the Preface to the Ordinal, which is confirmed by the 36th Article, the doctrine is maintained that, from the Apostles' time there have been these orders of Ministers in Christ's Church, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. The sermon previous to any ordination is to declare, "how *necessary* that order is in the Church of Christ," and in the 26th Article we are taught, that duly ordained Ministers, even if unhappily they be evil men, "do minister by Christ's commission and authority."

This subject is fully discussed by Rev. Arthur Haddan, in his volume entitled, "Apostolical succession in the Church of England."

NOTE B. PAGE 27.

In pronouncing the benediction, I do it not as a *finale*, but I feel that I am actually dispensing peace from God and by God's command. It is not the Priest but the priestly office that performs divine service.—*Rev. C. Simson, quoted by Sadler.*

NOTE C. PAGE 29.

As God regenerating us in baptism, ingrafts us into the fellowship of his Church, and makes us his by adoption, so he performs the office of a provident parent, in continually supplying, (by the other sacrament,) the food by which he may sustain and preserve us, in the life to which he has begotten us by his word.—*Calvin. Ins. iv. 17.*

The fountain of our regeneration is there presented to us; the partaking of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ is there offered to us.—*Homily on keeping clean of Churches.*

Grace is a consequent of sacraments, a thing which accompanieth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from God Himself, the author of sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them. All receive not the grace of God which receive the sacraments of his grace, neither is it ordinarily his will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any but by the sacraments.—*Hooker v. Ch. lvii., (4.)*

This is therefore the necessity of sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is, or hath, for the general good of his whole Church, by sacraments he severally deriveth into every member thereof. For we take not baptism, nor the Eucharist, for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies, assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual, whereby God, when we take the sacraments, delivereth into our hands, that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify.—*Ib., (5.)*

Baptism and the Eucharist are proper instruments, whereby the sacrifice of Christ is applied and made beneficial unto us, and were instituted for this and no other end.—*Chillingworth Sermon, viii.*

NOTE D. PAGE 30.

We ought to consider that, at whatever time we are baptised, we are washed and purified once for the whole of life. Wherefore as often as we fall, we must recall the remembrance of our baptism, and thus fortify our minds, so as to feel certain and secure of the remission of sins. For though when once administered, it seems to have passed, it is not abolished by subsequent sins. For the purity of Christ was therein offered to us, always is in force, and is not destroyed by any stain, it wipes and washes away all our defilements.—*Calvin Instit. iv., 15.*

Baptism is a sacrament, which God hath instituted in his Church, to the end that they which receive the same, might thereby be incorporated into Christ, and so through his most precious merit obtain, as well that saving grace of imputation which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life.—*Hooker lv. x., (2.)*

Truly if we consult the Fathers, in this case, they will unanimously tell us that we are not only distinguished from others, but regenerated by God, in baptism; yea that in baptism our sins are pardoned to us, and our corruptions subdued under us.—*Beveridge on Art. xxvii.*

Some persons have supposed, that the judgment in Mr. Gorham's case determined that "baptismal regeneration" is not taught by the Church of England; but the language of the Lords of the Council was carefully guarded, so as to leave no room for this assumption. After stating what Mr. Gorham's opinions appeared to be, the judgment proceeds; "the question which we have to decide is, not whether they are theologically sound or unsound, not whether upon some of the doctrines comprised in the opinions, other opinions opposite to them may or may not be held with equal or even

greater reason by other learned and pious ministers of the Church; but whether the opinions now under our consideration are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its articles, formularies and rubrics, requires to be held by its ministers, so that upon the ground of those opinions the appellant can lawfully be excluded from the benefice to which he has been presented."

NOTE E. PAGE 31.

The flesh and blood of Christ feed our souls, just as bread and wine maintain and support our corporeal life. For there would be no aptitude in the sign, did not our souls find their nourishment in Christ. This could not be, did not Christ truly form one with us, and refresh us by the eating of His flesh, and the drinking of his blood. But though it seems an incredible thing that the flesh of Christ, while at such a distance from us, in respect of place, should be food to us, let us remember how far the secret virtue of the Holy Spirit surpasses all our conceptions. Therefore what our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive, viz: that the spirit truly unites things separated by space.—*Calvin Inst.* iv. 17, (10.)

Christ's body is *really*, that is *truly*, given to us in the supper, to be wholesome food for our souls. I use the common form of expression, but my meaning is, that our souls are nourished by the substance of the body, that we may truly be made one with Him, or what amounts to the same thing, that a life giving virtue from Christ's flesh is poured into us by the Spirit.—*Calvin on 1 Cor.* xi., 24.

It is on all sides plainly confessed; 1st., that this sacrament is a true and real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth Himself, even his whole entire person, as a mystical Head, unto every soul that receiveth Him; and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ, as a mystical member of Him, yea of them also whom he acknowledged to be his own. 2nd, that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his Holy Spirit, to sanctify them, as it sanctifieth Him which is their head. 3rd, that what merit, force, or virtue, soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood, we freely, fully and wholly have it by this Sacrament. 4th, that the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life.—*Hooker v. Ch.* lxxvii. (7.)

What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not, it is enough that, to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, His promise in witness hereof sufficeth, His word he knoweth which way to accomplish. Why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this; O my God thou art true; O my soul thou art happy.—*Ib.* (12.)

We do expressly pronounce that, in the Lord's supper, there is truly given unto the believing the body and blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God, which quickeneth our souls, the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and that the supper is the communion of the body and blood of Christ, by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, and be fed unto immortality, and whereby we are joined, united, and incorporate, unto Christ, that we may abide in him and he in us.—*Jewell's Apology* ii. (1.)

NOTE F. PAGE 32.

The fathers of the Church of Christ call usually the ministry of the Gospel *Priesthood*, in regard of that which the Gospel hath proportionable to ancient sacrifice, namely the communion of the blessed body and blood of Christ, although it have properly now no sacrifice.—*Hooker v. lxxviii.* (2.) Upon

this *Waterland* remarks; Mr. Hooker feared not to say that sacrifice is now no part of the Church ministry, and that we have properly now no sacrifice; I presume he meant, by *proper* sacrifice, *propitiatory* according to the sense of the Trent Council. In such a sense as this, he might justly say that sacrifice is no part of the Church ministry, or that the Christian Church has no sacrifice. But I commend not the use of such language, be the meaning never so right; the fathers never used it.—*Waterland Charge*, 1738.

This is it in the Eucharist, that answereth to the sacrifice in the Passover, the memorial to the figure. To them it was "do this in prefiguration of me," to us it is "do this in commemoration of me." By the same rules that theirs was, by the same may ours be termed a sacrifice; in rigour of speech neither of them, for to speak after the exact manner of Divinity, there is but one only sacrifice, properly so called, that is Christ's death. And that sacrifice, but once actually performed at His death, but ever before represented in figure from the beginning, and ever since repeated in memory to the world's end.—*Bp. Andrewes' Sermons* ii, 305.

From the sacrament is the applying the sacrifice. The sacrifice in general, the sacrament in particular to each several receiver. Wherein that is offered to us, that was offered for us, that which is common to all made proper to each one, while each taketh his part of it.—*Ib.*

Q. What is that you call the commemoration in the Sacrament?

A. It contains the signal representation of the sacrificing of Christ, as the Lamb of God to take away the sins of the world, where the signs are; 1, the bread and wine; 2, the minister's breaking the bread and pouring out the wine; 3, the presenting them to God as the commemoration of the sacrifice in which we trust.

Q. What think you of the names sacrifice, altar and priest here?

A. The ancient Churches used them all, without exception from any Christian that ever I read of.

1. As the bread is justly called Christ's body, as signifying it, so the action described was of old called a sacrifice, as representing and commemorating it. And it is no more improper than calling our bodies, and our alms, and our prayers, sacrifices.

2. And the meaning of the table or altar, as related to this representative sacrifice, is no more improper than that other. "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat," seems plainly to mean the sacramental communion, and the Revelation vi. viii. 3, 5, xvi. 7, and oft, uses that word.

3. And the word priest, being used of all Christians that offer praise to God, it may sure as well be used of those whose office is, to be subintercessors between the people and God, and their mouth to God in subordination to Christ's priesthood.—*Richard Baxter's Catechism*.

The sacrament of Christ's body and blood may as well be called by the name of sacrifice, as those (under the Law) were. They were typical, and this is a commemorative sacrifice. This is properly our Christian sacrifice, which neither Jews nor Gentiles can have any share in, as the Apostle observes, "we have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle."—*Beveridge Sermons* viii.

It was a mere question of words, to dispute concerning the term *sacrifice*, to consider the extent of that word, and the many various respects in which the Eucharist may be called a sacrifice;—one is, because there is an oblation of bread and wine made in it, which being sanctified are consumed in an act of religion. Another is, because it is a commemoration, and a representation to God of the sacrifice that Christ offered for us upon the cross, in which we claim to that as our expiation, and feast upon it as our peace offering. Upon these accounts, we do not deny that the Eucharist may be well called a sacrifice, but still it is a commemorative sacrifice and not propitiatory.—*Burnet on Art.* xxxi.

NOTE G. PAGE 32.

This Sacrament is a more special and particular representation, and setting forth, of Christ as our Redeemer, than either the written or preached word. God has appointed Him to be *evidently crucified before our eyes*, that every poor soul, ready to die by sin, should look up to Him and be healed. Let faith represent Christ to our souls as here exhibited of God, and given unto us, as tendered to us, and received by us, and incorporated with us. To every communicant there is, by the grace and faithfulness of God, and through His ministers, a tender of Jesus Christ in His death and all His benefits.—*Dr. Owen quoted by Bickersteth.*

NOTE H. PAGE 34.

Will ye mark one thing, that *Epulemur* doth here (1 Cor. v. 7, 8) refer to *immolatus*? To Christ not every way considered, but as when He was offered. Christ's body that now is. True; but not Christ's body as now it is, but as then it was, when it was offered, rent and slain and sacrificed for us. Not as now He is glorified, for so He is not, so He cannot be, *immolatus*; for He is immortal and impassible. But as then He was, when He suffered death, that is passible and mortal. And we are in this action not only carried up to Christ, (*sursum corda*), but we are also carried back to Christ, as He was at the very instant, and in the very act, of His offering. So and no otherwise doth this text treat; so and no otherwise do we represent Him. By the incomprehensible power of His Eternal Spirit, not He alone but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate into His death, and invested in the benefits of it. If an host could be turned into Him now, glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ *offered* is it; thither we must look.—*Andrewes' Serm. ii. p. 306.*

NOTE I. PAGE 34.

In the Sacrament is a certain change, in that that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively presentation of Christ's body, and not only a figure but effectuously representeth His body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small change, but such a change no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ's word.—*Bishop Ridley.*

The Primitive Church believed not any change of substance in the Sacrament. For they even affirmed the bread and wine to remain after consecration, but that by the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost they were Christ's body and blood, not only by way of type or figure, but in real power and effect.—*John Johnson.*

NOTE K. PAGE 35.

I cannot but doubt the wisdom of urging all men indiscriminately to be present at the Holy Mysteries, a matter left open as far as I can see by the Prayer Book, and in ordering of which it may seem most natural to abide by the spirit of the ancient Constitutions, which did not willingly permit even the presence of any but communicants, or those of whom the clergy had reason to believe that they were in a way to become such, the rather in that there appears to be some danger of the idea gaining ground, which meets one so often in R. C. books of devotion, of some special quasi-sacramental grace, connected with simply assisting devoutly at Mass, over and above that promised to all earnest and faithful prayer.—*Letter in Coleridge's Life of Keble ii. 589.*

I cannot deny that I have a strong feeling against the foreign custom of encouraging all sorts of persons to "assist" at the Holy Eucharist, without

communicating. It seems to me open to two grave objections: it cannot be without danger of profaneness or irreverence to very many, and of consequent dishonour to the Holy Sacrament; and it has brought in and encouraged, or both, (at least so I greatly suspect), a notion of quasi-sacramental virtue in such attendance, which I take to be great part of the error stigmatized in our 31st Article. This I believe to be utterly unauthorized by Scripture and antiquity; and I can imagine it of very dangerous consequences.—*Letters of Keble, No. cxv.*

NOTE L. PAGE 37.

Certainly nothing less is required, by the laws of Christ and His Church, than to communicate as often as we can possibly find an opportunity, and to make one where we find it not, by requesting, and if need be, by requiring, the minister of the Parish where we live, to administer it to us; who neither in law nor conscience can refuse it, when requested by a sufficient number of communicants.—*Beveridge Sermon, No. cxxx.*

Let every one, who has any desire to please God, or any love for his own soul, obey God and consult the good of his own soul, by communicating every time he can; like the first Christians, with whom the christain sacrifice was a constant part of the service of the Lord's Day. And for several centuries they received it almost every day. Four times a week always, and every Saint's day beside. Accordingly, those that joined in the prayers of the faithful, never failed to partake of the blessed Sacrament. What opinions they had of any who turned his back upon it, we may learn from that ancient Canon, "If any believer join in the prayers of the faithful, and go away without receiving the Lord's Supper, let him be excommunicated, as bringing confusion into the Church of God."—*Wesley Sermons, No. cvi.*

If you cannot live up to the profession, they make who communicate once a week, neither can you come up to the profession they make who communicate once a year. But cannot you indeed? Then it had been good for you that you had never been born.—*Ibid.*

NOTE M. PAGE 46.

St. Paul's addresses and exhortations are founded on the principle, that the disciples, by their dedication to God in baptism, had been brought into a state of reconciliation with Him, had been admitted to privileges which the Apostle calls on them to improve. On the authority of this example, and of the undeniable practice of the first ages of Christianity, our Church considers Baptism as conveying regeneration.—*Sumner's Apostolical Preaching p. 180.*

We are instructed to declare, that those who are devoted to Christ as infants by baptism, are regenerate, i. e. are "accepted of God in the beloved," and dying without actual sin, are undoubtedly saved. Therefore we hold that those who grow up may, or may not, fall from this state of grace; and that those who have fallen may, or may not recover, and be finally saved, and therefore, that all are to be exhorted to "examine themselves, whether they be in the faith;" to repent and turn to their Saviour, if they are not; to labor if they are, still more after the "inward renewing of their souls day by day."—*Ibid. Page 188.*

The Apostle addresses in general terms, and without any distinction, as children of God, the whole Corinthian Church, inclusive as it afterwards appears of immoral and irreligious characters. Upon this view of the case, the rulers of the Church of England have proceeded. All her baptised members are saluted as children of God, as dearly beloved brethren; then diversities of character are recognised, instruction is given, consolation and reproof, and warning, and correction are administered; and prayer is offered up according to the various exigencies of the case.—*Hugh McNeill's letters p. 80.*

NOTE TO PAGE 16.

Since this charge was delivered, another elaborate judgment has been pronounced, by Sir R. Phillimore, in the case of *Shepperd v. Bennett*. Mr. Bennett was charged with promulgating certain erroneous opinions, with respect,—1st, to the presence of our Lord in the blessed sacrament; 2nd, to a sacrifice said to be offered in the administration of that sacrament; 3rd, to the adoration of the consecrated elements and of our Lord in that sacrament. After a very full discussion of the arguments, and authorities, the learned judge concluded as follows:—

“With respect to the second and corrected edition of his pamphlet, and the other work for which he is articulated, I say that the objective actual and real presence, or the spiritual real presence, a presence external to the act of the communicant, appears to me to be the doctrine, which the formularies of our Church, duly considered and construed, so as to be harmonious, intended to maintain. But I do not lay down this as a position of law, nor do I say that what is called the receptionist doctrine is inadmissible, nor do I pronounce on any other teaching with respect to the mode of presence. I mean to do no such thing, by this judgment; I mean by it to pronounce only, that to describe the mode of the presence, as objective, real, actual, and spiritual, is certainly not contrary to the law. With respect to the other charges, namely those relating to sacrifice and worship, I pronounce that Mr. Bennett has not exceeded the liberty the law allows upon these subjects.”

Notice of appeal, from this judgment, to the Committee of Council, was immediately given.

NOTE TO PAGE 21.

There has been a very interesting debate upon this subject, in the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury, conducted in a most loving spirit. The following are the concluding words of the able mover of the resolutions: “If any of those now separated from us could be brought to look back towards their fathers’ Church, towards the inheritance which they inherit with ourselves from our own reformers, with the same affection, yearning love, and sympathy, with which we regard them, I believe that when once we had arrived at such a point as that, we should look one another in the face for a moment, and rush into one another’s arms with tears of joy, and wonder what it was that had kept us so long separate.—*Chancellor Massingberd*.”

 ERRATA.

Page 14, line 18, for truths, read tenets.

“ 23, “ 26, *for offices, read officers.*